



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## SOME PRESENT ASPECTS OF THE QUESTION<sup>†</sup>

---

BY THOMAS D. GOODELL  
Yale University

---

Our question is: What is to be the future of classical studies in these states? It is a question having so many aspects that we can here examine only a few. I should like to take up some that seem to me pressing just now.

Since, however, the question concerns the future, primarily the future after our withdrawal from the glimpses of the moon, why occupy ourselves with it? Why, indeed, except that man has somehow become possessed of a moral nature? That future will be largely the child of our present, as this is the child of the past. As classical teachers we shall have more to do with making that particular child of the present than any other single class of the living. Our action being thus a factor—perhaps not so large as we imagine, but the only one we can control—we feel a certain responsibility. In short, the question holds us, as the Ancient Mariner held the Wedding Guest, and we can't get away from it!

The answers offered to any question, you know, depend partly on the point of view. On some of our problems, teachers in colleges and teachers in schools are rather prone to look on themselves as belonging respectively to different camps, not hostile exactly, but not quite in perfect sympathy and mutual understanding. That attitude of mind we must do everything in our power to correct; we cannot afford division in our ranks. That my point of view in this regard may be clear, perhaps you will pardon a brief personal note. The first ten years of my professional life were spent in a city high school preparing boys and girls for college in Latin and Greek. Since then my work has been well distributed through college and graduate school, from entrance examinations to the seminary in classical philology. This year I have read a large number of Yale entrance-examination books in all Greek subjects, and a goodly

<sup>†</sup>Read before the New York Latin Club, November 21, 1908.

selection of papers of the same range from the board examinations; my classes are freshmen beginning Homer, a course for juniors and seniors, and graduates. You will see that my points of view are fairly numerous. In fact, the points make up the whole line, so far as Greek teaching is concerned, with some years of personal experience in secondary-school Latin. Whatever may be your several locations along that line, I am one of you. I am a school man talking to school men and women and to college men; I am a college man talking to school men and to university men. At every point I am your equal colleague, and not an alien.

It must be confessed, however, that my Latin experience is the least vivid in my memory. The Latin side of the question is also, in some aspects, less pressing. Not only do all colleges require Latin for the B. A. degree; the better scientific schools, like the Sheffield School, also require a modicum, and are not, so far as I know, seriously proposing to do away with that requirement. Very few people imagine that it is well to leave Latin out of the provision for a liberal education, whether the education is to be of a literary type or of the scientific. The need of Latin has lately been brought strikingly to our attention at Yale College by the new generation of Chinese students asking admission. The company of 120 students brought over a generation ago by Dr. Yung Wing came as young boys and got their preparation for college with American boys; but these newcomers of course have no Greek, and have had scant opportunity to learn Latin. Could we, in view of these difficulties, accept substitutes for Latin as well as for Greek? We were told that Oxford and some famous American colleges were sweeping all difficulties about requirements for the benefit of Chinese applicants. Now it isn't a question of college rules; these can be changed if a college thinks best. But we had to ask ourselves, Is it really for the *benefit* of these Chinese to admit them to college without Latin? We could but answer, no. One may acquire many scraps of western learning without Latin, no doubt; but how can one gain that understanding of the history and life and mind of Europe and America which these Chinese youths need to fit them for service in the new China without some first-hand knowledge of Rome and its dominating influence during these nineteen centuries? You might as well try to

know the mind and life of Japan without any knowledge of Chinese and of China. Latin is not less needful for an American youth who would fit himself for any large public service than it is for these Chinese. And this is generally recognized. For that very reason, among others, reforms in teaching Latin are more urgent even than in Greek; but that is not my present topic. Latin will stay in our schools a few generations yet, even though we continue to teach it no better than at present. But Greek is losing ground, and rather rapidly, and that is my more especial field. And Greek is of course at the center of our question.

Let me make it clear that the present status of Greek does not in itself seem to me discouraging. Whether my own college, Yale, was wise or unwise in allowing substitutes for Greek and making Greek wholly elective, is a question I no longer ask. That question is settled and does not interest me. It is purely academic. (How curious, by the way, that in such a context the word academic is a synonym for vain, foolish!) I was never one of those who felt that the removal of the requirement from Greek would pull down about my ears the house I had been building. Quite the contrary. The new conditions, so far as they consist in the absence of requirement and the changes resulting from that, do not appear to me to be a disaster. They appear to me rather to create a great opportunity. Instead of lamenting the old conditions, I am simply eager to build up on the new basis a better house than the old ever was. To me the opportunity is an inspiring one—an opportunity that no college and no school, so far as I know, has yet really begun to grasp. Princeton is doing something to build better under an approximation to the old conditions, on a quasi-requirement; but no college, I repeat, has yet fully recognized the immense opportunity now open to teachers of Greek. To you who are still teaching required Latin I may say,

*Non equidem invideo, miror magis.*

You are left to do alone a great service in American education, a service which we on the Greek side once had to share with you. We, however, are now left free to render another, a different service—in one sense higher; though in a deeper sense I fully believe, with Browning, that all our service ranks alike; there is no last nor first. I waste no energy in a desire to revive the requirement of Greek;

I wonder, rather, that my colleagues do not all rejoice, as I do, in the new opportunities which the new conditions unfold so invitingly before us.

But the new conditions do include a large diminution in numbers of Greek students. For example, in Yale College at the opening of the academic year in 1903, 60 per cent. of the freshmen chose Greek; the percentages in the succeeding years make the descending series, 55, 50, 46, 44, 36. Or taking the freshmen in another way, of those admitted in 1905 on examination, 83 per cent. offered Greek for admission; in the succeeding years the percentages make the descending series 77, 68, 57. We must expect this decrease to continue for a time.

Now to look on this loss of numbers not only as unfortunate, but as the central trouble, is a fundamental error. This is not the disease at all; it is merely a result of the disease, so purely external that it has no value for diagnosis. It is like a high death-rate. It merely shows that something has been wrong; it gives no hint of what was wrong. For diagnosis, on which to base treatment, we must look elsewhere. Possibly, though I would not assert this, too many were studying Greek under the old system. It is quite evident that too many for whom the old teaching of Greek was not worth much were studying Greek. Convincing evidence of this is the plain fact that so many of that class hated the subject, and on reaching manhood attacked the requirement and got it done away with. They did this because they themselves got so little which they could recognize as having value. Is not this a clue to the real nature of the disease? Give as much weight as you fairly can to other causes—to the inherent difficulty of the language, to its remoteness from the superficies of modern life, to its utter lack of direct applicability to bread-winning, to increasing regard for wealth and worldliness; after all is said, the hard nub that remains for mind and conscience to chew upon, with no hope of softening or cracking or otherwise disposing of it, is this: The reason so few students take Greek is that so few in the community at large believe that the kernel is worth the trouble of cracking the shell. The diminution in numbers will continue until equilibrium of motives under free choice is reached. Individual mistakes will be made, of course, and in both directions;

but taking it in the large we may say: The number taking Greek will be determined by the general belief as to the value of the kernel and the hardness of the shell, but primarily as to the value of the kernel. And that is a sound principle. Why not? Also, the general belief of thoughtful people—for in this matter we are concerned only with the more thoughtful part of the community—will be determined chiefly by personal experience, which is ultimately, in the main, the school and college experience of those who take Greek. What do those students find, after the process is over and judgment is matured by contact with life—what do they find to be the relation between the value of the kernel and the labor of cracking the nut? That is the ultimate, the determining, question. It is being settled for the next generation in your classroom and mine. How much of the real kernel are our students getting? That is the heart-searching question for you and me. We shall retain Greek in the general scheme of liberal education so far, and so far only, as we produce, through “blessed experience”—in the good old prayer-meeting phrase—the belief that the kernel is worth while. The opportunity to produce that conviction is now far greater than under the old conditions; it is to this opportunity that I apply the epithet inspiring. It is on this basis that I am eager to build up, and assist others to build up, a far better house than the one that has been pulled down. I see no other basis for any house at all for Greek in general education.

To all this some of my friends say: But that policy will kill Greek! This response might tempt one to a variety of rejoinders which are better suppressed. It seems at first hardly relevant. It is, in fact, an emotional reassertion of the speaker’s original belief; the denial of my conclusion rests on an unspoken charge, the ground of which is inferred from, but not legitimately involved in, the argument I present. There is in the response a quality that we are prone to call feminine, though it is from men, not women, that I hear it. However, to disregard wholly the logical process leading to a conclusion, and endeavor to refute the argument by denying the conclusion, indicates a mind that no argument can reach. One who takes that manner of meeting an argument will remain of the same opinion still. Nevertheless I will follow this response a little farther.

When I ask, What do you mean by saying that what I put forward as a remedy for the disease will kill the patient, the answer can be only this. You would make Greek hard; that will still farther lessen the number taking it; and that is fatal. Still harping on numbers, you see! But let us look at it a moment from that side, because this is a view that is widespread; both in colleges and in schools teachers fear to exact a reasonable standard of attainment, lest the numbers taking Greek grow smaller still. What shall we say to that attitude?

In the first place, Greek is already dying, in your understanding of that term, rapidly enough. If my explanation of the cause of that phenomenon is wrong, what is yours? It was under the old régime that Greek got in the way of dying. Your present therapeutics are not saving it. Have you any other plan, beyond continuance of the same treatment? If you suggest, as the phrase is, that one should "meet the students half way," that is, be very moderate in demands, not expect the boys to work much, let them use the translation freely, translate and lecture to them, give easy examinations and let them through—under that plan, I say, two results follow. First, nobody gets any power to read Greek. Nobody gets at the real kernel at all. A little more is gained, I grant, than from reading translations exclusively, but very little. Secondly, numbers go on diminishing just the same. A third result, even more serious, sometimes follows. It is natural enough for college boys to yield to the weakness of youth and choose an easy course. Temporarily you may, by appealing to that motive, retain a larger number of students than some colleague, though you can never compete with English or history or French or economics. But how often we see those very youths, and in a surprisingly short time, regret their unwisdom, judge the instructor who tempted them, and condemn him for not requiring more. Your students will never say that to your face; they may think it and say it to others. If, then, desire for personal reputation be a part of your motive for seeking numbers, the result may be lamentable. But let us leave this point, and return to the second-named result, the continuing loss of numbers. At Harvard the competition of subjects intrinsically easier and more generally attractive has been most severe, and the most serious and well-

directed effort has been made to meet it by making Greek attractive without severity. The official reports of the percentage of failures are clear on the point of severity, while the distinction and high character of the Greek faculty guarantee the quality of their effort. *But this does not stay the ebbing tide.* Can any institution less strong hope to succeed in that line, where Harvard fails? On the other hand, many of you, no doubt, have had the experience prettily illustrated in the following case. A boy who failed with another instructor in freshman Greek took the year over with me. Dealing faithfully with him, I too declined to pass him. To my surprise, not only did his father thank me warmly for my service to his son, but the youth himself was eager to try it again with me the next year. This was merely a striking instance of a common occurrence. We do our generous young men an injustice, if we assume that they care more at heart for ease than for intellectual progress. They detect, and sooner or later condemn, him who appeals to their weakness; they respect, and are far more likely to honor, him who makes a reasonable appeal to their manly strength. We need not fear to do that with a subject so rich in appeal as ours.

But I said that teachers do fear, in both school and college, to exact a reasonable standard of attainment. Let me make that definite by a statement of facts for which the blame is well distributed between school and college. A year ago I took from the examination books written in June, 1907, twenty books in Greek grammar and composition which had received our passing mark. They were taken haphazard from the examinations in various parts of the country, not more than two from one lot. The errors on these papers I endeavored to reduce to a statistical form. A few samples will suffice here.

The principal parts of six common verbs, which occurred in the passage printed on the paper, were called for. On the twenty papers the average number of correct answers, each verb treated as a unit, was 1.7 out of 6; say 28 per cent. Three gave none correct throughout; seven gave one; four gave two; five gave three; one gave four. Remember, these papers were all marked for passing. In this rating no attention was paid to the marking of  $\bar{a}$ ,  $\bar{i}$ ,  $\bar{v}$ , although all grammars and beginners' books are exact in this. Candidates who noticed at



all the request to mark these were mostly quite absurd in their notions. That is because few teachers make anything of it in pronunciation. As a mere arbitrary addition to spelling, such marks are of course a nuisance and source of confusion, and also quite useless. Clear quantities should be part of the living word; but to too many teachers as well as pupils no Greek words are alive.

The inflection of *δίδωμι* in the present indicative active was called for—not a severe test surely on *μι*-verbs. Nine out of twenty failed. But all were passed. The inflection of *πράσσω* in the perfect indicative middle was called for. Eighteen out of twenty failed. But all were passed. The synopsis of *ἔλαβον* fourteen, or 70 per cent., were unable to give. All were passed.

The passage for translation into Greek I divided into twelve short phrases, and noted how many of these phrases were written into correct, i. e., grammatical and intelligible, Greek. Six gave none of the twelve, four gave one, six gave two, one gave three, two gave four, one gave six. The best one gave half, and deserved, on this part of the paper, the passing mark which all received. Of invented and non-existent verb forms, in this composition exercise two candidates used seven each, two used five, three used four, four used three, five used two, two were content with one. Only two used none.

Need I go farther to illustrate my point? We accept still, for admission to college, a degree of ignorance of the elements of Greek which is tolerated in no other subject. My study of board examinations and their marking leads to the same conclusion. And the only way we of the college can affect this directly is by making ourselves unpleasant in the entrance examinations to still more of the candidates, largely innocent victims.

One other illustration. For three years now in the Yale catalogue, among the notes on the classical papers in the entrance examinations, has stood this paragraph:

A written examination cannot test the ear and tongue, but proper instruction in any language will necessarily include the training of both. The school work in Latin and Greek, therefore, should include much reading aloud, writing from dictation, and translating from the teacher's reading. Learning fine passages by heart is also very useful and should be more practiced.

We formed this term an optional division of the freshmen for Greek composition. Inquiry the first day brought out the fact that no one of the twenty-seven members, who were of course among the most ambitious and best-prepared men of the class, had ever had an exercise in writing Greek from dictation. One only had been expected to learn any Greek by heart. Now about half of these twenty-seven men had offered German for entrance, and the other half French. Practically all had been trained to write the modern languages from dictation, and learned passages by heart. Inquiry shows, it is true, that in the class as a whole conditions were not quite so bad for Greek; several good schools do now employ such exercises. As I have set forth at length elsewhere, I do not think any considerable improvement in the Greek situation can be made until the sharp line of cleavage between ancient and modern languages now drawn in our classrooms is wiped out. Mr. Rouse, of the English Cambridge, is showing us one way of doing this effectively.

American education, as we are all aware, is undergoing searching examination from bottom to top. You and I are a part of what is being investigated, and we are bound to take an active part in the investigation and apply the results to ourselves. The great modern watchword, efficiency, though sometimes misapplied, stands for a sound idea. The thing most often urged against the college is inefficiency, as shown in the toleration of low standards. Among the most recent indications of this take President Garfield's inaugural address at Williams, President Wilson's address at Haverford on October 16, and Dr. Pritchett's paper in the November *Atlantic*. "The nation needs trained and disciplined men," says President Wilson; "men whose minds are accustomed to difficult tasks and to questions which cannot be treated except by minds used to precise and definite endeavor. . . . Such men it is not getting from the present processes of college life." None know better the truth of this indictment than we who are teaching classics. To take an active part in the reorganization of education which is impending is our duty and our high privilege. Our first step must be to put our own house in order on the new basis, in the new spirit. Do we mean to flinch and wait for others to put us in order? Our mathematical brethren have kept pretty well to the right path; from the nature of

their subject they have been little tempted to fall away. There is no longer any reason why our Greek departments should not at once join them.

To do this we should at once cease to cater to the dawdlers, to those who are only looking for the "gentlemen's courses," those against whom, in President Garfield's phrase, the college should "close the doors promptly." This means not merely that we should demand more; it means also that we should offer more. Opening to our youth the intellectual wealth that we ourselves prize, urging them to enter and possess, we must courteously insist that there is no other entrance than through mastery of the language for intelligent reading, and then *intelligently reading*. Greek is not, whatever experience under old habits may seem to indicate—Greek is not so difficult but that young people fairly endowed can in five years gain a reading power comparable with that attainable in German in three years. If less is gained, the fault is primarily ours.<sup>1</sup> And as a criterion of success for a college department, instead of the number of freshmen taking Greek we should look rather to the number who at the end of sophomore year can read Greek. There are very few of these now; what hope have we of getting more by following the old plan? If numbers of so-called students are to be our criterion, we are already defeated; if numbers of educated men able to read Greek are to be the criterion, there is hope of a large

<sup>1</sup> Of course the test must be applied with common-sense. We are not to overlook differences of dialect; the necessity of taking Homer at an early stage means the loss of a year in mastering the language as a whole. Nor must we overlook difficulties of thought, nor the fact that German lyric style is commonly easier than prose, Greek lyric style, like the English, more difficult; nor should we forget corruptions of text. But in a general way we may put the *Cyropaedia* beside a serious novel, Theokritos beside Fritz Reuter, ordinary tragic dialogue of good tradition beside the poetic drama of Goethe or Grillparzer; we may compare the bulk of Plato and Demosthenes with German parliamentary or editorial or literary discussion, the *Philebos* or Aristotle's *Metaphysics* with Kant. Furthermore, the reminder that many students of German gain little power in three years is irrelevant. Only the better half of the students in the two languages should be compared. In my senior year at Yale I was reading Plato's *Republic* and Lessing's *Laokoön*. My records made at the time show that we found less than two Teubner pages of the former a sufficient daily task, while four to six slightly larger pages of the latter were not too much. It was my second year in German, my sixth in Greek. That indicates fairly, I think, the relative effectiveness of the teaching we had had. My present juniors find three pages of the *Protagoras* rather stiff.

gain. Shall we strive to retain numbers, with the certainty of failure, or shall we aim primarily to attract quality, and to develop power? These are the two paths open to us. And they diverge. Do your best to compromise, you soon come to a point where the two aims refuse to be reconciled. *In either case* numbers, for a time at least, will fall. And in fact ten citizens, not teachers, who are at home in Sophokles and Plato, and have had some glimpse of Aristotle's place in the world, would be a larger contribution to this people than any college can make by conducting hundreds through the old required Greek, and there an end. That our students should look back on our courses and say: Yes, that was very pleasant, I enjoyed hearing him read that to us—that I grant, is better than nothing. Even milk and water contain a little food. But is it suitable nurture for healthy young men?

And why indeed should the teacher of Greek take toward students the attitude of the office-seeker, humbly suing for votes, with a view to his own aggrandisement? His position is nearer that of a preacher of the gospel, calling men to accept salvation. Here and there, no doubt, circumstances make a moderate number of students a matter of importance—as when a public high school contemplates cutting out Greek as too expensive for the number taking it. In such a case one must use his best judgment, making as much as he can of the following argument. Every high school feels bound to teach chemistry or physics, or both, though numbers may not be large. But these are expensive subjects to teach; laboratories and apparatus and small divisions are necessary and costly. No doubt these subjects are demanded; possibly they should be taught in high schools, though professors of physics among my acquaintance think their subject, at least, cannot be taught seriously to pupils of the high-school age. But strange as it may seem, some don't want chemistry, nor physics, but do want Greek. To deny for Greek an expenditure per pupil equal to that granted for chemistry or physics is contrary to the democratic spirit of our public schools. Nothing more clearly tends to raise the level of a community than to keep the road to the highest culture open to the poorest, from whom, by divine providence, come in each generation many of the intellectual leaders of the race. Occasionally, perhaps, proper presentation of

these facts may accomplish as much as a few more students. And in general the Greek teacher is strong in the respect of the community, if he be a good one. There is a widespread feeling, traditional and well-founded, that one who knows Greek well is somehow better off intellectually. One can use this fact without presuming on it. Holding in trust an intellectual treasure, the teacher of Greek would fain hand it on to all who can receive it. He appeals to those who desire to enter most fully the higher ranges of our intellectual and spiritual world—to be at home in the only aristocracy that our age has any use for, the aristocracy of a genuine liberal culture. This treasure is within the reach of everyone who has the energy to take it, paying the needful price in labor; it is not available for the dullard, nor for him who seeks the line of least resistance. But a boy who has in him the making of an intellectual man—a scholar in the Emersonian sense, “man thinking”—likes to have his mental powers appealed to. He likes wholesome and sound intellectual food that requires masticating; he does not like to be put off with milk and water, or pap. A boy with the right stuff in him, though he be unable to go beyond the course preparatory to college, can readily make Homer a possession for life. The teacher who leads five boys each year to do that has accomplished more for civilization than he who gets a hundred into college, but in such fashion that hardly one of the hundred is moved to read Homer after school days are over.

And the solution of our question rests mainly with the school teachers. In school the basis for a useful classical education must be laid. The first four years of Latin and the first three years of Greek settle the case, for good or ill. The college can, and some colleges will, require a better quality of Greek for admission; but the teaching ability of the school sets the limit. Meantime the college must do what it can to repair, in freshman year, for those who choose to continue, the deficiencies of previous years. And note that it is chiefly the teaching in the school that determines now whether a boy will continue Greek in college. If a boy's appetite has been raised, he will want more; if his interest has been dulled by the sense that he has been getting nowhere, he drops his burden at the college gate. On this point great is the responsibility of the teacher. In the graduate school we must take such students as come—many

of them still unable to read Greek or Latin in any proper sense; we must do our best to repair the deficiencies of college years, lead our students into some command of the languages, and give them a rational notion of their task as teachers. Original investigation, for one who cannot yet read Greek or Latin as he would read French or German if he expected to teach French or German, would seem to be an absurdity. Yet I grant, because I have seen it, that attempts at original investigation may be one means of learning a language, useful to that end for the student, however worthless otherwise. But what our schools need first of all is teachers of Latin to whom reading a famous Latin book is not a task, teachers of Greek to whom reading a famous Greek book is a pleasure. Real command of the language for reading, such as one expects in a modern language—that, I cannot say too often, is the first thing; the second is assimilation of as much as possible of the great books. And that, whether one expects to teach, or is merely seeking that broadening of the horizon which we call a liberal education.

If now we classical teachers can recognize and seize our opportunity, and begin to train pupils really to read the classics, I have no forebodings for the future of classical study. If many influences draw strongly away from Greek, others, and those of an enduring nature, draw toward it. Some of these latter influences have been materially strengthened in the few years of the current century. The interest in art is becoming more general and more serious in this country. But the serious study of any branch of art as a historical expression of humanity leads directly to Greece. This is as true of Italian painting and of modern architecture as it is of English or French poetry. "The types presented by Renaissance art," says Bernhard Berenson, "despite the ephemeral veerings of mere fashion and sentiment, still embody our choice, and will continue to do so, at least as long as European civilization keeps the essentially Hellenic character it has had ever since the Renaissance." This is not the dictum of a professional Hellenist, but the conviction of a distinguished critic of painting. Again, discoveries in central Asia within five years have put beyond question what was before believed, but not quite proved, that the painting and sculpture of China and Japan are largely descended from the art of Greece. The region of northern

India in which Buddhism matured was profoundly influenced by Hellenism; coins, architecture, sculpture, and painting display this clearly; and Buddhism carried with it to China and across the Sea of Japan the types and methods of expression learned from Hellas. And now we find Roman law coming from the west to meet in Japan the offshoots of Hellenic art that came hither from the East. Could anything more strikingly illustrate the profound and subtle nature of the force that has streamed from Greece and Rome? Think, too, of the great collections of Greek art in our museums—still in their infancy, but already a power in popular education; here is an active stimulus to popular interest in Greece, an interest that will respond in unforeseen ways to good teaching of Greek. The rise of modern sculpture began from the Elgin marbles less than a century ago; Greek earth in Europe and Asia is still enlarging, with no sign of exhaustion, our store of ancient treasures that reinforce and broaden that influence. The increasing attention to philosophy also draws in the same direction, back to Plato and Aristotle, whose life-giving force in the realm of thought is no more abated than is that of the poets. In fact the historical examination of civilization in well-nigh all lines of its development takes one sooner or later to Greece, usually to Athens. There will always be people, proportionately more in the next half century, rather than less, eager to follow the stream back to the fountain-head. If we will but give them what they need, they will come to us—not in throngs, perhaps, but in sufficient numbers, and of a sort to draw out our best powers in teaching, and to reward us with results. I have confidence in the future of this people. It will have its full share of well-trained minds—of artists, of thinkers, of men and women of genuine culture. A due proportion of these will desire to read Greek; it is our place to see that there are men and women who can so teach it as to meet that need.

Alfred de Vigny stated our creed; his *Bouteille à la Mer*, written just fifty years ago, is pre-eminently a poem for our profession:

*Le vrai Dieu, le Dieu fort, est le Dieu des idées.*

Which is the poet's finer way of saying that in the evolution of society the better thought finally prevails. God is on the side of the better thought. Working as we are for true and not sham social advance, we can await the issue tranquilly. It is our part to face realities

without blinking, choose our course with our eyes on truth alone, put our strength into the task, and smilingly say with de Vigny's Captain, May it succeed, if it is Heaven's will. Casting our work out among the throng of our fellow-men, we may have full confidence that, if worthy, the hand of God will guide it to port.

*Jetons l'œuvre à la mer, la mer des multitudes:  
Dieu la prendra du doigt pour la conduire au port.*